

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 20, 2007. Claims 1-18 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The Examiner and his supervisor Examiner Brian Werner are thanked for conducting an interview with the Applicant on Thursday September 20, 2007 at 1 PM EST (10:00 AM PST). During the interview the Applicant pointed out that in *Jun* space was not filled in between the germs. The Examiner's indicated that they considered that the germs were abutting leaving 'little space' between the germs. Applicants point out that in Fig. 11 (element Fsk) of *Jun*, there is vertical space between the key regions, but there is also significant horizontal space on the left and right of the canvas caused by the uneven widths of the key regions. In general, there will be empty space both horizontally and vertically (e.g. *Jun* Fig. 12B (element Fsk); Fig.13A (element Fsk)). This occurs because rectangular key regions of different sizes generally will not pack the rectangular canvas perfectly without gaps. Applicants point out that 'little space' is still 'space' and as such *Jun* does not teach filling this space. Applicant's invention provides a method to utilize this empty space to display some context surrounding the key regions.

Claims 2 and 10-18 are amended. Claims 19-21 are added. The amendment to Claim 2 is supported in the specification as filed at least at paragraph [0032] and Figure 4. The amendment to Claim 10 is supported in the specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0028], [0045] and [0053]. The amendment to Claim 13 and Claims 19-21 are supported in the specification as filed at least at paragraph [0058]. Claims 1-21

remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 14-18 are amended to correct the dependency. The Examiner is thanked for his careful reading of the claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 175(a)

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §175(a) as allegedly failing to conform to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner is thanked for his careful reading of the claims. Claim 13 has been amended to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Jun et al., U.S. Publication No. US 2001/0020981 (hereinafter *Jun*).

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of *Jun*. While *Jun* may disclose the layout of an image on a canvas, it does not disclose the "filling in the space of the canvas" limitation of Claim 1. The Examiner directs the Applicant to Figures 13A, 13B and 17 and importantly does not direct the Applicant to any teaching in *Jun* that discloses this limitation explicitly. Inspection of the Figures 13A, 13B and 17 reveals in each case considerable space that is not filled (i.e., the area in the canvas that is white). While *Jun* arranges the content within the canvas it does not implicitly disclose

filling in the space in the canvas. Since *Jun* does not disclose filling in the space, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Jun*.

Claim 10 has been amended with the limitation “filling in the space of the canvas with one or more parts of the image from the support”. During the interview, even the Examiners admitted that in *Jun* there was no space or that it was filled with the germ. Since *Jun* does not disclose filling in the space of the canvas with parts of the image from the support, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 10. Accordingly, amended Claim 10 is not anticipated by *Jun*.

Claims 12 directly depends from independent Claim 10, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 10 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 102(b) rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Jun*, in view of Uchihashi et al., ACM Multimedia: “Video Manga: Generating Semantically Meaningful Video Summaries” (hereinafter *Uchihashi*).

Claim 1 has the limitation “filling in the space of the canvas. Since neither *Jun* nor *Uchihashi* teach or suggest filling in the space of the canvas, they do not disclose all limitations of Claim 1. (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 1 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 10 has been amended with the limitation “filling in the space of the canvas with one or more parts of the image from the support”. During the interview, even the Examiners admitted that in *Jun* there was no space or that it was filled with the germ. Since neither *Jun* nor *Uchihashi* teach or suggest filling in the space of the canvas with parts of the image from the support, they do not disclose all limitations of Claim 10. (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 10 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 2 has been amended to more distinctly point out the invention and includes the limitation “determining a group within each of the plurality of video segments having the largest 3-D volume”. Since neither *Jun* nor *Uchihashi* teach or suggest analyzing based on the largest 3D-volume, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of amended Claim 2. Further, Claims 2-6 and 13-15 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1 and 10, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 1 and 10 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Claims 7-9 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Jun*, in view of Li et al. U.S. Publication No. US 2006/0023786 (hereinafter *Li*).

Claim 1 has the limitation “filling in the space of the canvas. Since neither *Jun* nor *Li* teach or suggest filling in the space of the canvas, they do not disclose all limitations of Claim 1. (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 1 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 10 has been amended with the limitation “filling in the space of the canvas with one or more parts of the image from the support”. During the interview, even the Examiners admitted that in *Jun* there was no space or that it was filled with the germ. Since neither *Jun* nor *Li* teach or suggest filling in the space of the canvas with parts of the image from the support, they do not disclose all limitations of Claim 10 (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 10 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 16 have the limitation “assigning a pixel value of each point in the canvas to the same pixel value in the support associated with the germ closest to each point”. Since neither *Jun* nor *Li* teach or suggest assigning a pixel value of each point in the canvas to the same pixel value in the support associated with the germ closest to each point, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claims 7 and 16. As such, Claims 7 and 16 were not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 17 have the limitation “if the germ closest to the point does not have a support that includes the point, the point is assigned the pixel value of the closest germ with a support that includes the point”. Since neither *Jun* nor *Li* teach or suggest if the germ closest to the point does not have a support that includes the point, the point is assigned the pixel value of the closest germ with a support that includes the point, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claims 8 and 17. As such, Claims 8 and 17 were not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 18 have the limitation “point is assigned a background value if no support includes the point”. Since neither *Jun* nor *Li* teach or suggest the point is assigned a background value if no support includes the point, they do not teach or suggest

all limitations of Claims 9 and 18. As such, Claims 9 and 18 were not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Further, Claims 7-9 and 16-18 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1 and 10, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 1 and 10 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Jun*, in view of *Li et al.*, U.S. Patent No. US 7,035,435 (hereinafter *Li2*).

Claim 10 has been amended with the limitation “filling in the space of the canvas with one or more parts of the image from the support”. During the interview, even the Examiners admitted that in *Jun* there was no space or that it was filled with the germ. Since neither *Jun* nor *Li2* teach or suggest filling in the space of the canvas with parts of the image from the support, they do not disclose all limitations of Claim 10 (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 10 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 11 directly depends from independent Claim 10, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 10 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2007

By: /Anthony G. Craig/
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer Number 23910